

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIANOTICE OF DOCUMENT DISCREPANCIES**FILED****08 AUG -7 AM 11:40***This space for
Clerk's Office File Stamp*

CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT

SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

Judge John A. Houston

*ECL*TO: U. S. DISTRICT JUDGE / U. S. MAGISTRATE JUDGEFROM: J. Hinkle, Deputy Clerk

RECEIVED

DATE: 7/21/08CASE NO.: 08cv883-JAH-LSP DOCUMENT FILED BY: No signature; Most likely PlaintiffCASE TITLE: Hennington v. VA San Diego Healthcare SystemDOCUMENT ENTITLED: Request Oral Argument

Upon the submission of the attached document(s), the following discrepancies are noted:

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Local Rule	Discrepancy
<input type="checkbox"/> 5.1	Missing time and date on motion and/or supporting documentation
<input type="checkbox"/> 5.3	Document illegible or submitted on thermal facsimile paper
<input type="checkbox"/> 5.4	Document not filed electronically. Notice of Noncompliance already issued.
<input type="checkbox"/> 7.1 or 47.1	Date noticed for hearing not in compliance with rules/Document(s) are not timely
<input type="checkbox"/> 7.1 or 47.1	Lacking memorandum of points and authorities in support as a separate document
<input type="checkbox"/> 7.1 or 47.1	Briefs or memoranda exceed length restrictions
<input type="checkbox"/> 7.1	Missing table of contents
<input type="checkbox"/> 15.1	Amended pleading not complete in itself
<input type="checkbox"/> 30.1	Depositions not accepted absent a court order
<input type="checkbox"/>	Supplemental documents require court order
<input type="checkbox"/>	Default Judgment in sum certain includes calculated interest
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> X	<u>OTHER: No signature or date. Not in pleading format.</u>

Date forwarded: 7/23/08ORDER OF THE JUDGE / MAGISTRATE JUDGE**IT IS HEREBY ORDERED:**

The document is to be filed nunc pro tunc to date received.

The document is NOT to be filed, but instead REJECTED. and it is ORDERED that the Clerk serve a copy of this order on all parties.

Rejected document to be returned to pro se or inmate? Yes. Court Copy retained by chambers

Counsel is advised that any further failure to comply with the Local Rules may lead to penalties pursuant to Local Rule 83.1

CHAMBERS OF: HoustonDated: 7/24/08

cc: All Parties

By: SW

Case Number:
08cv0883 JAH(LSP)
Ex-Parte

REJECTED

Application to

Respectfully Request Oral

ARGUMENT on the grounds

of ILLegal confinement 28 §

1826 and Conflict of

Interist Federal Laws

and the Admission of Evidence